



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,657	10/14/2005	Bogdan Serban	278869US2PCT	3753
22850	7590	05/25/2010		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER STONE, ROBERT M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/25/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10553657	10/14/2005	SERBAN, BOGDAN	278869US2PCT

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

**EXAMINER**

Robert M. Stone

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2629	20100518
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

The reply brief filed 11 March 2010 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

With respect to Applicant's response to the Examiner's interpretation of the term "connected" as being inconsistent with how the term would be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the electrical arts, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's narrow interpretation of the limitation "connected" is not commensurate in scope with the claim language presented for Appeal. Furthermore, the Examiner respectfully submits that the claim language on appeal is absent any claim language that would preclude the current interpretation. As noted in the Examiner's Answer as well as prior Office Actions, the term "connected" has multiple interpretations, all of which are applicable to the electrical arts. The term "connected" is a broad term which encompasses a plurality of specific types including indirectly connected (connected with components such as transistors, capacitors, resistors, etc. between them), directly connected (connected without any intervening components between the parts to be connected), physically connected (connected to the same wire/trace or even two electrical components constructed/mounted on the same substrate, panel, in the same device, and portions of individual components such as transistors), electrically connected (connected in some way within the same electrical circuit via wires/traces or some electrical component), or even wirelessly connected (a wireless connection can be made between computing devices without the need for physical connection such as wires) all of which, as shown, are applicable in the electrical arts. As such, the term "connected" alone can be interpreted any of these ways as was indicated in the previous rejections.

Further, with respect to Applicant's response to page 13 of the Examiner's Answer (page 2 of Reply Brief), Applicant's submit that the Examiner's statements (page 13-14 of EA) are "nothing more than a blatant attempt by the Examiner to bolster an incorrect position". Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner was simply pointing out that the Applicant's statement "The conductive traces 30 of Asher are therefore electrically conductive so that if a voltage is applied to the conductive trace via the fixed resistor, the conductive trace will be at the same electrical potential across its entire length." (page 8 of Appeal Brief) appeared to acknowledge that both ends of conductive trace 30 were at least electrically connected.

/Chanh Nguyen/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Robert M Stone/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2629